DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 253 268 JC 850 022

AUTHOR Cronin, Doug; Parkison, Teresa
TITLE Report on Employer-Based Training, 1983-84.
INSTITUTION California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.
PUB DATE Jan 85
NOTE 35p.; Discussed as Agenda Item 11 at a Meeting of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges (Sacramento, CA, January 24-25, 1985). Best copy available.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Community Colleges; Financial Support; *In Plant Programs; *Job Training; Labor Education; *On the Job Training; Program Evaluation; *Retraining; School Business Relationship; State Programs; *Technical Education; Technological Advancement; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

California's Employer-Based Training (EBT) Program focuses on preparing individuals for the new technologies of the future and responding to the real and current skills training needs of business and industry. The three major program components are: new programs in high and emerging technologies; private sector support for worksite-based training; and retraining of displaced workers. This report evaluates the 1983-84 activities of the EBT Program, including comparative information on 1982-83 operations. Following an executive summary and recommendations for continued program funding, a description of the EBT Program is presented, including an enumeration of program goals, criteria, and components. After a section discussing state and local resources available for EBT, aspects of program operation are described, including planning, coordination, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. Next, the results of the second-year program review are presented in the areas of course activities, referral process, instruction, educational support services, facilities and equipment, ethnic and gender participation, training completion and employment rates, operational problems identified, and program impact. Finally, the achievement of the 1983-84 EBT objectives is assessed. Attachments include data on funding and college programs. (HB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G. Hayward

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED253268

Board of Governors of the
California Community Colleges
January 24-25, 1985

Item 11

Title: Report on Employer-Based Training, 1983-84

Staff Presentation: Doug Cronin, Administrator
Employment Training

Teresa Parkison, Analyst
Employment Training

Summary

The Budget Act of 1983 provided two million dollars to community colleges for the Employer-Based Training initiative. The amount allocated for employer-based training at local community colleges was $1.9 million with an additional $100,000 for administration.

The budget language required that the Chancellor's Office, provide the Legislature and the Governor with a report evaluating the programs and recommending whether or not they should continue to be funded on a categorical basis. That report is due February 1, 1985.

That report is the body of this information item. Since the budget language for 1983-84 was identical to that of the previous year, the format for this report follows the 1982-83 format.

The report includes a comparison of the programs during both program years. Board action is not required for this item.

JC 850 022

Chancellor's Office
California Community Colleges

REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE ON THE EMPLOYER-BASED TRAINING PROGRAM

1983-84

February 1, 1985

AG 53

Table of Contents

	Page
Executive Summary	1
Program Description	6
Resources	9
State	9
Local	9
Program Operation	10
Planning	10
Coordination	11
Implementation	12
Project Monitoring	12
Evaluation	12
Employer-Based Training Educational Program Review	13
Course Activities	13
Referral Process	13
Instruction	13
Tables	
1 Instruction	14
2 Support Services	15
3 Participants Ethnicity	16
Completion of Training and Employment	16
Operational Problems	18
Impact of Educational Programs	18
Achievement of Employer-Based Training Objectives	19
Attachments	21

Executive Summary

1. The Employer-Based Training (EBT) Program is a State program in high-technology and employer-based training that focuses on preparing individuals for the new technologies of the future and responds to the real and current skill training needs of business and industry.

2. Three major program components were developed to reflect the purpose and goals that are directed toward immediate employment of displaced workers and employment with a future;

   A. New Programs in High- and Emerging Technologies that are developed in coordination with private employers and that provide on-the-job training;

   B. Private Sector Support for Worksite-Based Training to encourage acquisition of local matching funds from the private sector, and to stimulate ongoing partnerships between community colleges and their local business, industrial and labor committees;

   C. Retraining Displaced Workers by establishing educational programs in fields which have employment potential, and which build on the existing skills of displaced workers.

3. A total of $3,120,791 was made available at the state level from provisions of average daily attendance and Vocational Education Act and Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) for allocation to the community colleges for EBT educational programs.

4. Support generated by community college districts from local private industry was approximately $1,623,000, of which about $1,610,000 represented donation and loan of equipment, facilities and supplies. Another $1,644,545 provided by the community colleges was primarily to supplement costs of teachers salaries and wages; counseling and tutoring services and remodeled facilities. Combined State and local resources for EBT in 1983-84 in funds and services was $6,327,057.

5. Twenty-two continuing projects were approved and community Colleges submitted 41 new educational proposals for funding, and 17 proposals were approved. "High-Technology" the component of 32 of the projects in such occupational areas as robotics technology, computer-aided drafting and manufacturing, mini/microcomputer maintenance and telecommunications. Nearly 82 percent of the participation in training was in occupations that were designated as being "high-technology."

6. Males represented 65 percent and females 35 percent of enrollments. Male representation decreased slightly and female representation increased when only "high-technology" projects were considered.

7. Ethnic participation in the training projects by category was 53 percent White, 7 percent Black, 41 percent Hispanic, 2 percent Eskimo/American Indian, and 24 percent Pacific Asian. The percentage of white participation in high-technology training was significantly above that for all projects, but less for Blacks and Hispanics, whose major participation

was still in new and emerging occupational training. Eskimo/American Indian and Pacific Asian representation was constant for all projects and "high-technology" projects.

8. The percentages of participants who completed training projects ranged from 60 percent to 100 percent. At least 24 percent of those who did not complete training left to take jobs.

9. As few as 20 percent and as many as 95 percent of unemployed participants in training programs were employed following completion of training. The majority of employed participants who received skills upgrading training were employed in training related employment following completion of training.

10. Operational problems identified by community colleges included the need for: a) better testing and screening of applicants to assure that they meet the limited skills required to successfully complete the training; b) more time to plan projects after notification of funding; c) slower paced training for those who have been out of school for some time; and d) a funded job development placement component.

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Employer-Based Training Program achieved its original objectives in training individuals and in allowing the colleges, through the acquisition of equipment, to enter the "high tech" training arena.

PROGAM CONTINUITY

The EST Program should be continued at least at its presently funded level. Based upon the $8 million of requests received, we feel that at least $4 million could be used effectively for continued expansion of the colleges' ability to provide programs in emerging occupations and high tech training. However, in order to make more efficient use of any additional funds allocated for the program, we recommend that the following criteria, developed from our analysis of the most successful projects, and recommended to be included last year continue to be applied in the selection of future projects in employer based training.

(1) A strong labor market demand for the skills training must be demonstrated.

(2) There should be evidence of close ties with business and industry for assistance in resources and commitment to hire successful program completers.

(3) An 80 to 90 percent completion rate with attrition due mainly to employment ("job-outs").

(4) At least 75 percent of participants gainfully employed in jobs related to training completed.

REASONS FOR MAINTAINING CATEGORICAL FUNDING

We recommend that these funds be maintained as a categorical program to support employer-based training.

Adequacy of Funds for Individual Projects

Due to the limited amount of dollars available, if the funds were added to the other apportionment funds and distributed on a formula basis, very few districts would receive sufficient dollars to operate or begin a new program.

Leveraging or Matching Other Fund Sources

We have used the categorical funds to leverage other funding courses from the private sector and Vocational Education Act as well as other state, local, and federal funds. Colleges had the opportunity "up front" to be able to approach other funding sources with resources of their own.

Flexibility of Fund Availability

Through the EBT as a categorical program, colleges were provided with the flexibility to respond more quickly and directly to industry training needs with courses and programs. They were able to match available resources with immediately identified training needs within their community. By contrast, community colleges typically rely upon the apportionment funds as their major source of income and base their budget on the expected amount available. Budgets are generally negotiated beginning in January and completed in May for the following year and do not contain funds for unplanned programs.

Equipment Upgrades

Equipment necessary to provide "state of the art" instruction was made available because of this categorical funding as it was considered over and above what the colleges had included in their budgets. With college budgets becoming more restrictive in the past few years, there has been a tendency to use funds available to maintain staff at the expense of other needed components of educational programs.

Program Direction and Monitoring

The Chancellor's Office, in implementing the Employer-Based Training program, was able to design the elements necessary in each program which were in the best interests of the state, such as the required linkage with industry, and was able to verify that each element was included through a grant review process.

With categorical funding, the Chancellor's Office was able to directly influence the selection of target industries and populations such as the concentration on high tech industries and on displaced workers in areas of high visibility. Under an apportionment system, the Chancellor's Office has no direct influence on the colleges to have them provide programs directed at a particular industrial area or population.

The Employer-Based Training Program also provided funding for necessary staff to monitor project activities and outcomes which helped to identify successful aspects of programs that could be replicated or required in future projects.

Employer-Based Training (EBT) Program

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The EBT program in high technology and employer-based training focuses on preparing individuals for the new technologies of the future, and responding to the real and current skill training needs of business and industry. For the purposes of the Employer-Based Training initiative, High Technnology is defined as follows:

> HIGH-TECHNOLOGY is a term used by business people to describe a wide variety of industries and businesses that make and use the new technologies of the future include the following types of industries: computer

manufacturing, electronics components, medical technology, communications technology (radio, TV, radar, satellites, telephone, microwaves), instruments for measuring and controlling manufacturing processes, energy technology, environmental technology, defense/aerospace, photographic equipment, lasers and optical technology, engineering, and computer (data processing) services. The emphasis in skills training is in math and science subject areas.

The success of the California Worksite Education and Training Act (CWETA) over three years offered a model for much of the rest of the employment-based training conducted in California. CWETA focused on training which included on-the-job training, career upgrade possibilities, and specific agreement with employers to hire upon completion of the program.

Overall goals for the Employer-Based Training program include:

-- To provide training in new and emerging technological industries.

-- To provide training for unemployed, underemployed, those affected by economic dislocations and those with obsolete or inadequate skills.

-- To secure deeper commitment and involvement from the business/industrial community in support of employment training programs.

-- To provide sufficient flexibility and encouragement to allow local colleges the opportunity of responding to local needs in a variety of forms, such as, new programs, high technology programs, securing facilities and equipment from industry, developing consortia of colleges or programs, or innovative grouping of programs and services.

-- To provide sufficient funds to accommodate approximately 3,000 individuals in training and retraining programs in the community colleges.

To facilitate accomplishment of the goals, the following criteria were established for EBT educational programs and services in community colleges:

1. Include business, industry and labor input in development of projects.

2. Include other agency for group participation in projects when appropriate, such as Employment Development Department, Rehabilitation, Department of Industrial Relations, Department of Commerce, Service Delivery Areas (SDAs) and other training providers.

3. Provide training which is short term in nature, one year or less, preferrably not over 26 weeks.

4. Provide skills training for job openings which have advancement potential.

5. Supplement and not supplant existing offerings.

6. Combine classroom and worksite training.

7. Have employers or consortia of employers committed to hire successful completers.

Program Components

Three major program components were developed to reflect the purpose and goals of the program.

A. "New Programs in High and Emerging Technologies": These programs establish new, specialized high technology programs and are developed in coordination with specific employers and would focus on providing on-the-job training, and, where appropriate, would use the CWETA model.

The specific criteria for eligibility under this component include:

1. Program is new to the community colleges.

2. Program provides a combination of worksite and classroom instruction.

3. Program is in a new or emerging technological field.

4. Local community resources are used to support the program.

5. Projects are developed through local cooperative planning efforts.

These programs follow the successful "Coordinated Funding"[1] model established last year by the Chancellor's Office, and provides training in such fields as Digital Logic/Computer Aided Machining, Computer Aided Drafting, Service Technician (Business Machines/Computer Repair), New Energy Technologies, Robotics, etc.

These programs also will help community colleges develop the expertise needed to upgrade existing courses to meet the high technology demands of the 1980's.

B. "Private Sector Support for Worksite-based Training": These programs meet the general requirements for EBT programs. The main purposes of this component are to encourage acquisition of local matching funds from the Private Sector (i.e., business, industry, labor), and to stimulate ongoing partnerships between community colleges and their local business, industrial and labor communities.

[1]A fiscal year 1981-82 program which combined funds from CWETA, JTPA and VEA for five projects in the High Tech areas.

Projects in this component;

1. Serve communities with high concentration of economically disadvantaged and high unemployment.

2. Serve areas with high technology industries.

3. Serve areas where there is a shortaged of skilled labor force to meet job demands.

4. Encourage industry involvement in the planning and design of programs.

5. Involve subject area new to, or in need of major revision at community colleges.

6. Combine employer based training and classroom instruction responsive to specific employer's needs.

C. "Retraining Displaced Workers": These programs retrain workers displaced by plant closures and mass lay-offs. They are coordinated, in each locale, with EDD funded efforts to support the reemployment of such workers (under SB 1109, SB 1115 and SB 1118, Bill Green, 1982). Established programs are mostly in fields which have employment potential and which build on the existing skills of the displaced workers, rather than in high tech fields.

Specific criteria for programs funded under this component are that they;

1. Build upon the existing skills workers have acquired in previous occupations.

2. Provide resources for programs which prepare the worker for a demand occupation.

3. Coordinate with and utilize existing federal and state financial resources such as those administered by EDD.

4. Build upon existing delivery systems rather than unnecessarily duplicating current courses and programs.

5. Promote industry and labor participation in identifying workers' pre-existing skills, determining their training needs, and placing them in new occupations.

6. Utilize to the extent possible the CWETA model, including worksite-based and apprenticeship-type training; using industry sites, equipment and expertise.

7. Assist the Department of Commerce in promoting the location of new industrial sites in areas affected by economic dislocations.

8. Coordinate activities with other agencies assisting displaced workers; EDD, Department of Commerce, Department of Rehabilitation and DIR.

Community Colleges interested in participating in the Employer-Based Training program were required to direct proposals to one of the three components, in addition to meeting the general eligibility criteria.

RESOURCES

State Resources

The State Budget Act for 1983-84 provided $2 million in Community College apportionments (ADA) to implement a portion of the Employer-Based Training program. Of that amount, $1.9 million was earmarked for educational programs and services in community colleges, and $100,000 was provided for administration of the program in the Chancellor's Office.

The $1.9 million allocation for educational programs and services was assigned to the three program components as follows:

A.	New Programs in High- and Emerging Technologies	$800,000
B.	Private Sector Support for Worksite-Based Training	550,000
C.	Retraining Displaced Workers	550,000

An additional $880,910 was obtained to augment the program from the Vocational Education Act (VEA) and $339,881 from Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA).

A total of $3,120,791 was therefore made available at the state level from provisions of ADA, VEA, and JTPA, for allocation to the community colleges for EBT educational programs. Of the available funds 3,065,263 was actually expended (see attachment 1) all of the funds were encumbered however one college was unable to accept their Grant toward the end of th efiscal year. $55,528 was the total of nonexpended fund which is less than 2% of funds available.

Local Resources

Community college districts generated support from local private industry in the amount of $1,628,749. The major portion of this sum represented donations and loans of facilities, equipment, supplies, expertise for curriculum development and equipment operations, and teacher training. Local private industry support for the program far exceeded the requirement to match the $550,000 made available from the state General Fund. Another $1,889,545 provided by the community college districts was primarily to supplement teachers' salaries and wages, counseling and tutoring services, equipment and supplies, and remodeled facilities. Combined local resources for EBT in 1983-84 was $6,394,085. This local support in funds and services was approximately 56 percent of all resources focused through the EBT in 1983-84.

PROGRAM OPERATION

Planning

Employment Training (E&T) staff were established in the Chancellor's Office to coordinate and administer the EBT program in community colleges.

Staff participated with other state agencies in development of the overall plan for the Employer-Based Training program and in the delineation of functions and responsibilities of each agency for effective coordination. (Details of the plan, functions and responsibilities were included in a report to the Legislature in November, 1983.)

In the implementation of the program in community colleges, E&T staff engaged in the following planning activities:

1. Established criteria and administered the process to allocate funds for new or expanding worksite related training programs in community colleges.

2. Developed and delivered workshops on activities which could be supported from Employer-Based Training resources.

3. Provided procedures for districts to apply for funds to match private sector resources.

4. Provide procedures for monitoring activites.

5. Developed programs to obtain matching VEA, JTPA, funds for worksite related training programs in new and emerging high-technologies.

6. Provide procedures and policies in conjunction with EDD to provide retraining for displaced workers.

7. Implemented project evaluation criteria and procedures.

8. Worked directly with community colleges developing applications for new or expanded worksite training.

9. Worked with multicampus districts or regional consortia in developing high technology programs.

10. Worked closely with other state agencies in a plan for coordination of resources and services at the state level.

In addition, staff made a number of presentations to various organizations and agencies concerning the provisions of the EBT program and its benefits to education, unemployed workers, business and industry, local communities and the state as a whole. Community College districts were kept informed of developments in the establishment of the EBT program in a series of memoranda issued by the Chancellor's Office.

To assure broad-based participation in planning educational programs for EBT in community colleges, an Advisory Council on Employer-Based Training was created in 1982 to guide the Chancellor on project funding, program evaluation and future policy development relative to the goals of the program.

Nominations for membership on the Council were solicited from the California Business Roundtable, the California Manufacturers Association, the American Electronics Association, the executive secretary-treasurer of the California

Labor Federation, the Interagency Committee and agency heads of the departments of Employment Development, Business and Economic Development, CWETA and Industrial Relations. Community College representatives were selected by the Chancellor with advice from the CCC Chief Executive Officers and the CCC Administrators of Occupational Education. Nearly half of the membership represents industry and labor, with the next major category of representation from state agencies that are involved in or have program interest in employment and training. (See Attachment 1 for membership of the Advisory Council on Employer-Based Training.)

The Advisory Council met on October 4, 1983, at which time members reviewed and recommended funding of project proposals. These proposals were the result of planning activities already conducted by the staff. The E&T staff also served as staff to the Council.

Coordination

Program coordination at the state level was conducted primarily through an interagency group that was formed to assure effective utilization of state resources and services. Employment and Training Services staff participated in interagency planning meetings, additional meetings with staff in various EDD Units relative to JTPA funding of EBT in community colleges.

Chancellor's Office staff, met with directors of projects recommended for funding to negotiate necessary modifications of proposal objectives and budgets, determine appropriate levels and sources of funding; and develop appropriate contract language.

Local colleges included community-based participation of the private sector, local government and EDD field offices in planning and developing their proposals for funding under the EBT program. Colleges were required to include a description of these activities in their proposals.

Implementation

Community Colleges submitted a total of 41 new proposals for funding under the program. New Proposals were received from 18 individual colleges and nine district offices. The ultimate responsibility for allocating funds to community college districts under the Employer-Based Training program rested with the Board of Governors, California Community Colleges. At the Board's meeting in October 1983, the Chancellor recommended projects to be funded to the Board based upon advice from and consultation with the Advisory Council on Employer-Based Training.

Thirty-nine proposals (22 continuing, 17 new) for EBT program funds were approved by the Board at its October 1983 October 1982 meeting. Distribution of funding for each project is arrayed in Attachment 2 by funding service. Attachment 3 is an array of funded projects, their program components, the length of training programs and the number of participant slots established for each project.

"High-Technology" was a component of 32 25 of the projects in such occupations as robotics technology, computer-aided drafting and manufacturing, mini/microcomputer maintenance, computer-assisted microwave technology and telecommunications. Over half of the projects with high technology components also had at least one other component. Nearly 829 percent of participation in training projects was in occupations that were designated as being "high-technology".

Chancellor's Office staff worked closely with community colleges in implementing their training programs, and generally acted as "trouble-shooter" for unforeseen problems. Some activities that staff were involved in included technical assistance in program development such as advising where similar programs existed or were being developed; assist with negotiations involving CWETA assist in the identification of dislocated workers assistance in budget modifications; and identifing use of various funds.

Project Monitoring

The VEA specialists were assigned to technical assistance duties, to work with the primary monitors to assure compliance with the regulations related to each funding source and to provide technical assistance to project staff in the colleges. At least two site visits were conducted at each project. In addition, projects which included JTPA, CWETA funds or which include coordination with local EDD activities had staff from those entities assigned to work with the Chancellor's Office monitor to assure that projects were meeting their program objectives.

Evaluation

Each project administrator was responsible for conducting progress evaluations and final evaluations as described in the contract. The Chancellor's office undertook a separate evaluation of the projects and of the overall success of the program under an evaluation plan developed by the staff. An outline of the final evaluation plan was provided to all project administrators to assure that information required for the state evaluation report on EBT in community colleges was maintained on program activities. Project monitors were responsible for obtaining data from the colleges for the final report utilizing a monitor checklist provided for this purpose.

IIP EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW

Course Activities

Information provided by local project directors indicated that 3,934 individuals participated in 347 training sessions in the 39 training projects. This represents approximately 98 percent of the planned course activities.

Course curriculum development was with the assistance of industry in the "high-technology" subject areas. In addition, advisory committees established by the colleges reviewed and approved the new curricula.

In the "high-technology" projects, the major focus was in the lab setting. The average lab hours or "hands on" hours per course was 1551.5 as opposed to

1312.5 for lecture hours. In other retraining areas, primarily for entry-level occupations, the average lab hours and lecture hours were approximately the same in a course.

Referral Process

Referral of 60 percent to EBT was from the colleges' regular student population. Thirty-one percent represented referrals from employees under agreements with colleges to provide upgrade skills training for their employees and from media advertisements. The remaining nine percent represented referrals from EDD.

Instruction

Three categories of instructors conducted courses in EBT projects: full time college faculty, part-time college faculty, and instructors hired specifically for the projects. All instructors possessed appropriate credentials, therefore, there was no need to provide credential waivers. Distribution of instructors and instructional hours for each category of faculty is listed in Table 1 below:

TABLE 1

Distribution of Instructors and Instructional Hours by Category

Category	Total Number	Total Instructional Hrs.	Average Instructional Hrs.
Full-Time	61	10,833	177.6
Part-Time	108	11,563	107.1
Hired for Project	59	5,172	88.7

Most of the instructors that were hired specifically for the projects were from industry. Teacher training for college faculty was provided by industry representatives on the operation of highly technical equipment that was either loaned or donated by businesses and industries.

Educational Support Services

These services included individual and group counseling remediation, career development and tutoring. At least 62 percent of the projects included an educational support services component. No special provisions were made in 15 percent of the projects for educational support services. Instead, they relied on campus services. Students who needed services were encouraged to make their own appointments at the campus counseling and learning centers. In one instance, students were referred to the Employment Development Department (EDD) for personal counseling. Another 23 percent of the projects were served

by special arrangement with colleges which assigned counselors, instructional aides and tutors to projects. The costs of these services were borne by the colleges. Table 2 displays the distribution of educational support services reported for the various categories of services:

TABLE 2

Distribution of Educational Support Services by Number and Hours

Category of Services	Number Served	Total Hours of Service	Average Hours per Trainee
Group Counseling	1,883	19,407	5.11
Individual Counseling	1,791	4,421	2.54
Remediation	677	26,618	18.82
Career Development	1,184	17,752	9.16
Tutoring	1,165	23,490	6.21
Other	99	140	

Very often tutoring and remediation occurred in the classroom during the course of instruction. Instructors found that many students referred from EDD did not have the necessary minimum reading and math skills for their courses. Career development services were primarily provided to displaced workers who had to make drastic occupational changes relative to their previous employment. Individual counseling, while focused primarily on personal adjustment problems, included educational assessment. One college had counseled 85 students for recruitment, and one college counseled 14 students in Computer-Assisted Lab.

Facilities and Equipment

Most colleges utilized existing facilities. However, 35 percent colleges remodeled existing facilities to accommodate new equipment. Six programs utilized employer facilities for lab instruction.

While most projects utilized existing equipment, the majority of the colleges obtained new equipment, mostly through support from private industry. Equipment for the CAD/CAM was extremely expensive, and without the donation, loan or lease of such equipment, the educational program would not have been conducted. Other highly technical equipment required for Laser/Electric-Optic technology was provided for educational programs by private industry. This support for all programs was approximately $1,610,249.

Ethnic and Gender Participation

Thirty-four projects representing 87 percent of the enrollments in projects provided data on gender representation and ethnicity of participants who were enrolled in EBT training, 1983-84.

Males represented 65 percent of enrollments, and females were 35 percent of enrollments. In those projects with a "high technology" emphasis, males were 66 percent of enrollments and females were 34 percent of enrollments. This is an indication that women were not only appropriately represented in all training programs, but that they had significant representation in training for occupations that are in demand and have potential for future employment.

Data on ethnicity of participants in all of the projects and "high-technology" projects only are arrayed in Table 3 below:

TABLE 3

Percentages of Participation in EBT Projects by Ethnicity

Category	Percentage of Total Enrollments	Percentage of High-Tech. Enrollments
White	53%	54%
Black	7%	5%
Hispanic	14%	13%
Eskimo/American Ind.	2%	27%
Pacific Asian	24%	26%

The percentage of White participation in "high technology" projects was significantly above that for all projects, and less for Blacks and Hispanics. However, the major participation of Blacks and Hispanics was in "high-tech" projects. Eskimo/American Indian and Pacific Asian representation was consistent.

Completion of Training and Employment

Information provided by the colleges on numbers of participants who completed the training varied substantially among the projects. Some districts provided percentages of completion, rather than numbers. In several cases, districts included in their counts of completions those who dropped out of the training for employment that utilized skills that has been acquired in the training. (For these participants, it can be assumed that the training was successful.)

It was also difficult to aggregate data concerning those participants who were employed following completion of the training. Again, some districts provided percentages of employment, or stated that "most" or "the majority" of completers were employed. Therefore, only a general statement can be made concerning the percentages of participants who completed the training, and who were employed following the training.

The percentages of participants who completed the training ranged widely from 60 percent to 100 percent. Five districts and three colleges reported that all of the participants who attended their training programs completed them. Reasons given for the failure to complete the training were:

-- 24 percent left the training to take jobs. A significant number of displaced workers from General Motors accepted transfer to the company's Oklahoma plant.

-- 29 percent dropped the training, stating that the training was too difficult.

-- 6 percent lost interest.

-- 21 percent left because of personal problems, e.g., illness, family obligations, personal problems and lack of money.

-- 20 percent stated that the drop-out was for other reasons, e.g., to enroll in another training or educational program.

There was a high correlation between the completion rate and employed participants who received training to upgrade their skills. In most part this can be attributed to the motivation of workers to retain employment. Another important factor was the high degree of interest and commitment of employers to their workers. The completion rates also were significant relative to unemployed participants where there was close coordination between colleges and private industry in the development of curricula and commitment of resources by private industry.

Data provided on employment following completion of training for the unemployed participants indicated that 30 percent of participants in a training program had obtained employment following training. It is possible that employment rates were actually higher, as a number of colleges had to rely upon employers and former participants to provide employment information, and responses were minimal. A number of colleges stated that they did not have the resources to devote to job development for those who completed the training, and that they relied upon EDD to provide placement services. Staff in EDD worked closely with the college to place as many of the participants as possible in other employment.

Up to as many as 95 percent of unemployed participants in some projects were employed following training. Again, where the colleges and industry worked closely together and maintained contact throughout the training, employment following training was significant. This was especially true where skilled workers are in demand in an industry. Several colleges reported that they had received inquiries from employers throughout the state who were interested in offering employment to participants who completed their training.

The majority of employed participants who completed their training were employed in training related employment immediately following completion of the training.

Operational Problems Identified

The major problem identified by colleges was that a number of participants were not prepared for the level of the training. They lack sufficient reading, writing, math and language skills. To retain these participants in the training, the colleges provided remediation in the classroom and through regular college services. The colleges suggested that they should conduct their own testing and assessment of applicants, rather than rely upon EDD to do the testing and screening.

Another significant problem concerned the lead time required to start a project after notification of funding. A number of colleges stated that limited planning time resulted in receiving necessary equipment, books and supplies for the training after training had begun. Availability of instructors was also reduced.

Several colleges noted that an accelerated course is too fast for those who have been out of school for several years. One of the suggestions was to not only lengthen the training, but to design the training into separate learning segments.

One college noted that there was a need for more training of the instructors.

Impact of Educational Programs

Generally, the comments from colleges as to the impact of their programs on their service areas were very positive. Some comments were:

- There is a strong labor market for qualified applicants. Employers constantly call the colleges for applicants who completed the training and to inquire about upgrade skills training for their employees.

- The project established the college as a leader in high technology in Southern California. As a direct result, the college has had inquiries from industry about future cooperative programs with the college. Also, inquiries have been received from other community colleges and from other states about establishing educational programs in high technological areas.

- Plant closures displaced unskilled workers with limited craft skills. The retraining project provided them with skills to be competitive in a tight job market.

- The project supplied new and upgraded employees for a growing electronic industry in the area thereby contributing to reduction in unemployment and opening up career opportunities for women, minority groups and the handicapped.

- Thanks to the support from industry in donation of equipment that the college could afford, we were able to initiate a very successful educational program.

- Several colleges stated that the project successfully employed individuals.

- One project stated that the course has stimulated interest and development for a CAD program both at the college as well as the local high school district. The college is in the process of assisting the high school to set up a program, which will be fully articulated with the college.

ACHIEVEMENT OF EMPLOYER-BASED TRAINING OBJECTIVES, 1983-84

1. To provide training in new and emerging technological industries.

   "High-Technology" was a component of 17 of the 22 continuing and 16 of the 17 new projects funded under EBT. Nearly 82 percent of participation in EBT projects was in high technology.

2. To provide training for unemployed, underemployed, those affected by economic dislocation and those with absolute or inadequated skills.

   Participants in EBT projects included:

   - Displaced workers because of plant closures. Many had obsolete or in adequate skills for the job market.

   - Employed persons whose employment was in jeopardy without retraining.

   - Unemployed individuals with no or limited marketable skills.

   - Women, minorities and the handicapped who were provided an opportunity for careers in occupations with a future.

3. To secure deeper commitment and involvement from the business/industrial community in support of employment training programs.

   Business and industry provided loan, lease or donation of equipment in the amount of approximately $1,610,000. Additional assistance was in curriculum development, training of teachers in use of equipment and participation on advisory committees established for projects. Six companies allowed use of their facilities for the lab or "hands on" phase of projects.

4. To provide sufficient flexibility and encouragement to allow community colleges the opportunity to respond to local needs in a variety of forms, such as new programs, high technological programs, securing facilities and equipment from industry, developing consortia of colleges or programs, or innovative grouping of programs and services.

The colleges included local business and industry and local governmental and private agencies in the planning of their projects. Analyses were conducted concerning the local labor market and the demand occupations in the area. They not only solicited equipment and use of facilities from private industry but involved industry in development of the training programs. They established advisory committees composed of industry, labor, private and public agencies, and citizens of the area. These advisory committees reviewed and approved projects and approved goals of the projects.

A tri-county consortium was continued in Orange, Los Angeles and San Diego counties for a CAD educational program that was conducted in five colleges in these counties.

Most of the training was not conducted in the normal semester or quarter mode. Existing curricula were modified to reflect skill requirements identified by private industry. New curricula were developed with participation of industry.

A number of colleges established educational support services as components of training projects. Tutoring and counseling were utilized extensively to assist participants who had limited verbal, written to math skills. Many of the students had adjustment problems relative to loss of their earning power because of plant closures; being in an educational setting that was foreign to them; and accepting the fact that new employment would not provide their previous wages.

5. To provide sufficient funds to accommodate 3,000 individuals in training and retraining programs in the community colleges.

A total of $3,065,263 was made available at the state level from provisions of ADA, VEA and JTPA. Support generated by community colleges from local private industry was in the amount of $1,622,249 primarily for loan, lease or donation of equipment. Another $1,644,545 was provided by the community colleges for instruction and educational support services. This funding made it possible to provide training and retraining for 3,934 participants, which represents 131 percent of the objective established for the program.

Attachment 1

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EMPLOYER-BASED TRAINING

Claire Biancalana
Instructional Dean
Cabrillo College

Virgil Collins
United Auto Workers

Bob Dippie, Tech. Trng. Spec.
& Sr. Personnel Admin.
Watkins-Johnson

Esther Greene
Deputy Director
Employment Development Dept.

James Rinehart
Dept. of Economic and
Business Development

Myrtle Ballard, Coord. of Coord.
Project/Bus./Interag. Prog.
Employment Dev. Dept. MIC 37

Paul Kimura
Manager, College Recruiting
National Semiconductor

Dr. David Mertes
Chancellor
Los Rios CCD

Eugene Janvier, Deputy Chief
Div. of Apprenticeship Stds.
525 Golden Gate Avenue

Dr. Robert D. Jensen
Chancellor
Rancho Santiago CCD

Bob Hermsmeier
St. Job Trng. Coord. Council
Employment Development Dept.

Steve Duscha
Employment Training Panel
Employment Development Dept.

Clarence Price
Hughes Aircraft

Ron Wood, Dir. of Ed. & Pers.
Calif/Nevada Conference of
Operating Engineers

Larry Garetto, Special
Assistant to the Director
of Vocational Education

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Attachment 2
1 of 3

Employer-Based Training Program
Fund Allocations and Distributions, 1983-84

Project Number	Community College	General Fund ADA			Federal VEA Funds		JTPA	Total State Allocations	Local Funds		GRAND TOTAL TO COLLEGE
		High-Tech	Displaced Worker	Match of Private Sector	Subpart 2	Subpart 4			a) College/ District	b) Private Sector	
		1,216,857.33	268,308.33	372,377.34	842,605	25,234	339,881	3,065,263	1,644,545	1,622,249	6,327,057
16	Laney			83,000				83,000			83,000
19	North Orange	134,347						134,347	50,000	15,000	199,347
20	Santa Ana	43,540						43,540	23,171		66,711
21	Palomar	220,000						220,000			220,000
22	Moorpark	31,388						31,388		10,000	41,388
23	Long Beach	7,887						7,887			7,887
24	North Orange	19,341						19,341	15,000	57,500	91,841
26	Los Rios	12,703						12,703			12,703
28	Foothill-De Anza	40,329.5		40,329.5				80,659		220,000	300,659
30	Los Angeles		42,301					42,301			42,301
31	San Mateo	40,727						40,727	54,000	75,000	169,727
32	Canada			101,752				101,752		83,130	184,882
33	Sequoias	8,540						8,540		5,000	13,540
34	Los Angeles	21,150.5		21,150.5				42,301			42,301

AG 53

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Attachment 2
2 of 3

Employer-Based Training Program
Fund Allocations and Distributions, 1983-84

Project Number	Community College	General Fund ADA			Federal VEA Funds		JTPA	Total State Allocations	Local Funds		GRAND TOTAL TO COLLEGE
		High-Tech	Displaced Worker	Match of Private Sector	Subpart 2	Subpart 4			a) College/ District	b) Private Sector	
		1,216,857.33	268,308.33	372,377.34	842,605	25,234	339,881	3,065,263	1,644,545	1,622,249	6,327,057
35	Glendale	9,467						9,467	30,314	28,000	67,781
37	San Mateo	156,804						156,804	70,000		226,804
38	Sonoma	16,665						16,665		5,560	22,225
44	Santa Ana			24,501				24,501	550,000		574,501
45	Los Angeles		14,217					14,217			14,217
46	Los Angeles		30,275					30,275			30,275
47	Foothill-De Anza		51,090				245,000	296,090			296,090
48	Los Angeles		12,639					12,639			12,639
301	Sequoias				20,986			20,986	11,415	6,300	38,701
304	Bakersfield	11,711			84,219			95,930	26,440	30,296	152,666
305	Saddleback				43,643			43,643	37,500	34,700	115,843
309	Glendale	58,084.33	58,084.33	58,084.34	52,965			227,218	609,591	185,103	1,021,912
312	Santa Monica	13,600			55,562			69,162	28,733	6,000	103,895
318	Southwestern	43,348			63,888			107,236	8,425	204,180	319,841

AG 53

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Employer-Based Training Program
Fund Allocations and Distributions, 1983-84

Project Number	Community College	General Fund ADA			Federal VEA Funds		JTPA	Total State Allocations	Local Funds		GRAND TOTAL TO COLLEGE
		High-Tech	Displaced Worker	Match of Private Sector	Subpart 2	Subpart 4			a) College/ District	b) Private Sector	
		1,216,857.33	268,308.33	372,377.34	842,605	25,234	339,881	3,065,263	1,644,545	1,622,249	6,327,057
319	Canada	43,560	43,560	43,560				130,680	72,783	10,000	213,463
320	Moorpark				26,487			26,487	725	22,970	50,182
323	Palomar	30,000			75,000			105,000			105,000
330	Long Beach				52,817			52,817			52,817
331	Long Beach		16,142			25,234		41,376			41,376
335	Fremont-Newark	26,608			21,636		40,617	88,861			94,461
336	Fremont-Newark	27,688			21,635		54,264	103,587	17,676		121,263
337	Palomar	61,587			59,725			121,312		50,000	171,312
338	Foothill-De Anza	132,433			70,121			202,554		500,000	702,554
340	Napa Valley	5,349			43,424			48,773	3,172	18,510	70,455
341	Laney				150,497			150,497	25,000	55,000	230,497

a) Primary represents district expenditures for teacher salaries and wages, classified salaries and wages and remodeled facilities.

b) Donations from the private sector of equipment and supplies, etc.

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

EMPLOYER-BASED TRAINING

PROJECTS AND PROJECT COMPONENTS, 1983-84

Project Number	Community College/District	Project Description	Length of Training	Number of Participants	Training Components		
					High-Tech	Displaced Worker	Private Sector
16	Laney	CAD/CAM	32 Weeks	198	X		
19	North Orange	Tri-CAD Consortium	40 Weeks	832	X		
20	Santa Ana	CAD	52 Weeks	57	X		
21	Palomar	Electronics	36 Weeks	99	X		
22	Moorpark	Laser/Electro-Optics	36 Weeks	11	X		
23	Long Beach	Robotics Tech	20 Weeks	13	X		
24	North Orange	CAM	40 Weeks	85	X		
26	Los Rios	Electronic Services Tech	32 Weeks	90	X		
28	Foothill-De Anza	CAD/CAM	37 Weeks	840	X		
30	Los Angeles	Information Process	24 Weeks	30		X	
31	San Mateo	Telecom Tech	40 Weeks	120	X		
32	Canada	Computer Technology	32 Weeks	125	X		
33	Sequoias	Printing	36 Weeks	30	X		

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

EMPLOYER-BASED TRAINING

PROJECTS AND PROJECT COMPONENTS, 1983-84

Project Number	Community College/District	Project Description	Length of Training	Number of Participants	Training Components		
					High-Tech	Displaced Worker	Private Sector
34	Los Angeles	Mini-Computer Maintenance	31 Weeks	26	X		
35	Glendale	Multi-Disciplined	39 Weeks	28	X		
37	San Mateo	Computer Applications	40 Weeks	100	X		
38	Sonoma	Electronics	24 Weeks	27	X		
44	Santa Ana	Telecom Tech	52 Weeks	184			X
45	Los Angeles	Computer Nutrition	17 Weeks	47		X	
46	Los Angeles	Print and Lithography	24 Weeks	24		X	
47	Foothill-De Anza	Displaced Workers	36 Weeks	104		X	
48	Los Angeles	Cognitive Skills	17 Weeks	12		X	
301	Sequoias	Auto Computer	23 Weeks	39			
304	Bakersfield	CAD	31 Weeks	56			
305	Saddleback	P/C CAD	16 Weeks	23			
309	Glendale	Information Process	28 Weeks	293	X	X	X

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

EMPLOYER-BASED TRAINING

PROJECTS AND PROJECT COMPONENTS, 1983-84

Project Number	Community College/District	Project Description	Length of Training	Number of Participants	Training Components		
					High-Tech	Displaced Worker	Private Sector
312	Santa Monica	CNC Machinists	31 Weeks	23	X		
318	Southwestern	CAD	28 Weeks	87	X		
319	Canada	Computer Program	32 Weeks	40	X	X	X
320	Moorpark	Electronics	32 Weeks	17	X		
323	Palomar	Automated Process Tech	31 Weeks	50	X		
330	Long Beach	Robotics	32 Weeks	16	X		
331	Long Beach	Cable CPW	30 Weeks	71		X	
335	Fremont-Newark	CAD	32 Weeks	30	X		
336	Fremont-Newark	Robotics	32 Weeks	14	X		
337	Palomar	CAD	31 Weeks	23	X		
338	Foothill-De Anza	Semi-Conductor	36 Weeks	509	X		
340	Napa Valley	Maintenance Repair	32 Weeks	15	X		
341	Laney	IBM Automation	20 Weeks	89	X	X	X

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
8118 Math-Sciences Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024
MAR 15 1985